

James Logan

THE  
LITERARY  
PAMPHLETEER.

---

NO. III.

---

Transylvania University.

NO II.

MR. EDITOR—An hour of leisure, again affords an opportunity, which my willingness to defend the cause of truth prompts me to embrace, of combatting a report that is doing serious injury to one of the most flourishing and important institutions in the western country. My reasoning to be sure is altogether *a priori*. It is however based upon such obvious suggestions as might be expected to present themselves to every reflecting mind.

I have already referred your readers to the fact, that the prevailing opinions of Kentucky are far from being friendly to Socinianism; in order to prove that the University in which that state appears to take so much pride is not, as some believe, under such dangerous influence. I have referred them also, to the *republican spirit* which our neighbors have always been so forward to evince, as repugnant to the idea that some two or three learned men from Boston, should be permitted to controul the sentiments of the rising generation, and give them a direction opposite to those which their father's entertain. For sir, let it be kept in mind, that if the Faculty of Transylvania University, are Socinian they constitute the whole amount of that connexion in Kentucky. Is it reasonable then to suppose that in so *republican* a state, a sect so small and unimportant, (and who are at war with all that bear the christian name) should be permitted to give a President to their University? What a sensation did the election of a Socinian Chaplain for Congress, create throughout the Union! And in no part of it, perhaps, was that sensation more sensibly felt than in Kentucky. Why? Because it was deemed an insult to a christian community, for their National Legislature, to invite to the religious solemnities of their body, one who made it the business of his life to undermine the very foundation of the christian faith. Is the Chaplain of a deliberative assembly of more importance, than the President of a public University? Or is the Legislature of a proudly Democratic state better entitled to bid defiance to the opinion of those who elected them to office, than the assembly of the nation's Delegates?

But sir, we have a still more satisfactory evidence than this, that the influence which is exerted upon the hundreds of young men who are annually brought within the walls of Transylvania, cannot be hostile to religion; I mean the *conduct of christians in that state*. Is it natural or liberal to suppose that all those whose principles are christian, and that still more numerous class who are only christian in their predilections, should see so many of their finest youth, brought every year immediately under the power of Socinian instruction, with silent indifference? Nothing can be more destructive of every thing like even the appearance of respect for religion in a community, where the mind is free, than to place infidelity (especially if she wear a mask) at the head of its schools and colleges. If this were the case in the only important University on this side the mountains, it would manifest itself by an universal excitement in the churches. It would be spoken of in every Methodist Conference, and every Presbyterian Synod, and every Baptist Association.—Christians of different denominations would forget their sectarian differences to unite in opposing this subtle advance of their common enemy; the very women would exclaim against such an outrage upon public sentiment, and feel solicitous that their sons and their brothers might not be brought within the “infected district.”—while many a watchman on the walls of Zion would sound “a note of remonstrance” so loud and long that it should be heard throughout all our borders. All who are friendly to religion would feel it their duty, firmly and freely, (tho’ mildly) to express their sentiments on a subject, with which interests that they deem of the first importance, are so materially connected, no personal considerations could keep them silent. From the Pulpit and the Press, again and again would it be brought before a community which calls itself *christian*. They would with one accord withdraw their support from an institution whose moral aspects are so unfavorable to all that they hold most sacred. And would they not be right in doing this? Would it be acting consistently with themselves, would it not be denying their own principles; would it not be betraying their Master, and disowning his cause, for christians to patronize a Socinian University?

Suppose a zealous Monarchist to be placed at the head of one of our public Seminaries; suppose it to be a flourishing institution; and rising rapidly to the highest rank—one situated in an extensive and fertile country, whose political character is just developing; and whose political destinies are to be moulded by the men who shall there imbibe their early partialities—would not every republican feel himself pledged to oppose such a nursery of monarchical opinion? Would not the Legislature which professes to be its guardian, be *promoted to private life*? Yes! every talent would be put into requisition. He who could write would address his fellow citizens from the Press; and he who possessed eloquence would raise his voice in their popular assemblies; the very boys in the streets would soon know that a monarchical Professor had been smuggled into their republican community, (and by the Legislature too)



to instruct and govern them. What a man of this description would be in a republic, a Socinian President of a College would be in an Anti-Socinian community.

As nowever, no such excitement has prevailed in reference to Transylvania University; as no one has ever had the boldness to charge the President of that interesting institution with inculcating such doctrines upon young men committed to his care, is not the inference fair that such reports are false? Would christians have been *afraid* to speak their minds, on a subject that concerns them so materially? Is there a gag-law in Kentucky? or have the editors of that state combined to deceive the people by closing their columns against a fair discussions of their moral and literary interests? Such suppositions are illiberal in the extreme—The opinion then, which I have been combating must be considered without foundation.

But it may be said perhaps, that christians form so small a minority in such a Society as that of Kentucky, that they could make no impression upon public sentiment, or upon a Legislative body: And that a knowledge of their own imbecility and insignificance would keep them silent. Let it be remembered, however, that if the legislature of that state have no regard for christianity, they surely can have no particular predilection for Socinianism—neither their religious nor political sentiments are of the "*Boston stamp*."—Allowing them therefore to be perfectly indifferent, they would be inclined to favor those opinions which prevail most extensively amongst their fellow citizens. From their republicanism alone, we might expect this.

Suppose however, that the prevailing impressions concerning the Kentucky University (which we have been endeavoring to disprove) are correct—suppose also, that the christian part of that, and those other states, from which she draws her revenue, felt duly and deeply convinced of the importance of keeping their principal seat of learning free from all sort of pollution; and that, acting under this conviction they should quietly withdraw (as surely they have a right to do) their support. I will not say that it would entirely overthrow, but would it not be a serious loss to the University? In order to avoid this loss, and secure the opposite gain, would not the Legislature be prevailed on to remove the cause by which it was occasioned, unless indeed some benefit must in this way be given up, which nothing could be found to replace? I think if they are reasonable men, disposed to consult the interests of learning; and impartially to extend the advantages of their institution to all classes of men, they would—But suppose they would not; and that being excluded from all participation in the one college, those who consider religion a matter of importance, were obliged in self defence to erect another—a rival institution—say in the adjoining state; let that receive their united support; let it be under the controul of men whose learning and piety are undoubted. Not men, who have gleaned their knowledge from Reviews and Magazines; not mere Novel readers, and lovers of Poetry and polite Literature; but men of profound

and various erudition. Let it be understood that at the one place every thing is favorable to Christianity—let it also be understood and *proclaimed* that at the other an intelligent and accomplished Socinian, bears uncontrouled dominion; and has craftily mixed up the leaven of his own principles with the materials upon which he has to operate, that almost the whole mass is leavened, which of these establishments is most likely to command the confidence and support of a christian community?

Thus sir, I have endeavored to prove by the only kind of evidence which is accessible at this distance, that the reports which are in circulation concerning the accomplished President of Transylvania University (and which are injuring that institution severely) are without foundation. Those who live in Lexington and its vicinity have more decisive evidence constantly before them—they have witnessed the *sedate dignity* of the man; and the *unction* of the minister; his aversion to every thing like *frivolity* of manners, or *fopsy* of dress; his meekness, his humility, his sacred reverence for the Sabbath day, & all the ordinances of religion.

Of all people in the world the Kentuckians are the most likely to respect an ingenuous, manly avowal of opinion; and to detest that cautious *pusillanimity* which would be unwilling to declare, or that *hypocrisy* which is sedulous to conceal sentiments which the public have an interest in knowing. Accordingly those who have the satisfaction of social intercourse with this distinguished gentleman, have doubtless often been delighted with the *decided testimony* which he is at all times ready to bear to the most interesting and important truths of christianity; those without which it is not to be distinguished from the religion of the Deist or the Mahomedan. And they who have enjoyed the pleasure of hearing him preach, have (by all accounts) reason to admire the *prominence* and *plainness*, with which his sentiments, upon these subjects, are exhibited. The citizens of Lexington have it also in their power to point to the institution itself; the *discipline* which has been there established—the “*steady habits*” which prevail among the Students, their *respect* for religion and order, and above all, their freedom from all kinds of *dissipation*. But we who have not an opportunity of making these observations, must content ourselves with less satisfactory proofs, such as are now respectfully submitted to your consideration by

Your obedient servant,

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

P. S. If Editors in Kentucky, have closed their columns to any remarks upon the manner in which the interests of Transylvania University have been managed; surely they cannot refuse to republish this refutation of these idle calumnies against her.



## SOME OBSERVATIONS AND NOTES ON THE PRECEDING.

As some of our distant readers may not be acquainted with certain facts, and circumstances alluded to, and argued against by the '*Friend to Truth*,' they may think his reasoning conclusive; it is therefore proper that his communication be followed with a few observations.

1. The fact that the creed of a President, in a public University, is a matter of doubt, or dispute, in a community not far distant, and which is interested in knowing what it is, may, and ought to be considered a strange phenomenon in a christian country. Yet this appears to be the fact with respect to the creed of the President in Transylvania University. Before he left Boston he was known as a Socinian of the grosser sort; but when he came to the west, he was so completely every thing in belief and practice that no one would charge him with *holding* the Socinian creed, or any other. And at this time, there are many, who ought to be well acquainted with him, who nevertheless cherish as different opinions respecting him as were ever cherished respecting the Chameleon: Thus I have heard one man remark, 'he is a Socinian,' and another say, 'no, he is an infidel' and a third say, 'he is more an Atheist than either.' Infidels are much pleased with him, and some of them have said, that if christianity be what he represents it, they have always been christians. The sober religious students, who have attended him, are of the opinion that he is, *an infidel in disguise*. And the irreligious students, who hate moral restraints, and who have gambled so outrageously, for two, or three sessions, that the Trustees applied to the Legislature to interfere for their reformation, appear ready to swear upon the *Coran*, the *Bible*, the *Shaster*, or a *Pack of Cards* that he is a very honest, impartial President, and a profound, dignified Philosopher. Now would it not be a very commendable thing in this *incog non-descript* President to speak honestly and openly for once, and let the public who are to patronize him, know satisfactorily what he is. There are some of us, who would merely from his silence, and the doubts which appear to hang over his character, conclude that he was no christian, or gospel minister. Dr. Holley's silence respecting his creed, since he came to the west, and his extreme caution not to appear in a tangible form from the Press, bring to our recollection the following anecdote. A certain Lady of respectability was afflicted with having a son who was an idiot; or destitute of good sense. Once having made arrangements for a social party at her house, and expecting some strangers, she charged her son, if any of them should speak to him, to keep silence, or they would find him out. The party came, and in the evening one of the strange gentlemen directed the conversation to this son, who according to orders, sat gravely mute. After some time the gentleman made another attempt to enter into conversation with him, but without effect. Turning to another gentleman he observed, 'I suspect that boy is a fool.' The boy hearing him, ran out to his mother, and said, 'mother! mother! they have found me out.'

The author of christianity has taught us that his ministers are as "a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid." That they are the *light of the world*, and that as men do not light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick so his ministers are not to be put under a bushel, but let their light shine that others seeing their good works may glorify their Father in Heaven. The Rev. H. Holley, though a President, has somehow, or other got under a bushel. In the pulpit he has not shone for some time. In the Professor's chair, those qualified to judge say, that "the light which is in him is darkness." That he is a Socinian or Infidel, and that the University is under his influence as such, we see now demonstrated from the *Transylvania Theses* which have been published, as the Latin exercises of the students, or a student, and which have been defended by a writer in a Lexington paper, under the signature of 'Utor.' In those *Theses* there is much truth, and much error mingled and combined after the old Socinian manner. 'Vindex,' a defender of the late administration in the Transylvania University and whom we have had occasion to notice before, is opposed to all religious instruction in a literary institution, yet the nine *Transylvania Theses*, or propositions, the production of students, are on Theology, and they are all constructed just as one acquainted with gross Socinianism, would expect from the students of an artful President of a University, who inculcates this heresy. The eighth and ninth *Theses* stand thus, "Revealed may be called only a picture of rational religion, since it has *only* the same principles expressed in words. *Either* will conduct men to Heaven provided they faithfully follow it." Now notwithstanding all that 'Utor' has advanced in favor of these *Theses*, or sentiments, it will be shown, in due time, if not in the *Pamphleteer*, somewhere else, that they are false, Socinian, and Infidel. All sound and well read Theologians will perceive this without any showing; and 'Utor' by the fact and manner of defending them has plainly shown that he is of the Socinian school. There is such a similarity in stile and manner between this writer, and the author of *A Discourse on the death of col. James Morrison*, that, until better informed, we must think that they are one & the same person. The author of that discourse did not appear "before the reading world," without putting between him & danger some of the most respectable of human beings, both living and dead. And 'Utor' in defending the Socinian and Infidel *Transylvania Theses*, has done little else than array between him and his opponents a variety of human beings, the most of whom are dead, and if alive would be ashamed of his company and expel him from their ranks. We know that others than Socinians, and weak Theological cowards, have, in controversy, had resort to the *Elders*, the *Fathers*, the *Rabbies* and *Doctors*, for support and defence in a bad cause and sometimes in a good one, but we care not for any *human* authority, whether ancient or modern, in matters of religion. And as 'Utor' has neither wielded the word of God nor matter of *fact* in his defence, we discover in it more art, than sound philosophy, or Theological skill, His show of learning, and his Deification



of departed Divines, Commentators, and Philosophers may impose upon the uninformed, and afford a kind of intrenchment for his security and the defence of Transylvania. But if he be a man of real learning and brain he ought to know, that detached sentences, or the erroneous, inconsistent, and contradictory expressions of fallible men, however learned and pious, are good for nothing in settling a disputed point in Theology. Of this 'Uttor' will probably in due time be convinced, when his human *oracles* will be of as little use to him as the *Sybylline verses*, and may lead to a more full exposure of his Socinianism and infidelity. Let no one hereafter assert that Dr. Holley does not inculcate his favorite, and distinguishing, sectarian sentiments in the Transylvania University.

2. The *Friend to Truth*, throughout his reasoning, represents Socinianism as radically opposed to all that is distinguishing in christianity—as *infidelity in disguise*; as destructive to the dearest interests of religion, &c. In all this we must grant that he is correct. And if the President of Transylvania University be a Socinian, we need go no farther than himself for evidence that it is what the '*Friend to Truth*' represents it. *Faustus Socinus* from whom the name of the sect is derived, lived in the sixteenth century. He and his followers differ on some points, yet they agree in their general system of unbelief. I say unbelief, because in distinguishing them as a sect we have to state what they do *not* believe, rather than what they believe. They do *not* believe that Jesus Christ is truly Divine; that he existed before he was born of the Virgin Mary—that he made an atonement for sin. They do *not* believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit—in the necessity of his renovating operations, and in the doctrine of the fall and depravity of our nature. They believe that the Father alone is God—that Christ is a mere man—that the Holy Spirit is an influence, a power, or virtue—that Christ died merely to attest the truth of his doctrine and to set an example of suffering. Their unbelief and their belief were known in the days of the Apostles and excluded, then and ever since, those, from the christian church, who exhibited them. The Apostles, Paul and John, called their teachers "False Prophets and Anti-Christi." They were disowned by all the reformed churches when they appeared in the sixteenth century, and have been down to the present time. And that they and the orthodox differ on the essentials of religion has been acknowledged by some of their ablest writers. Dr. Joseph Priestly, one of their modern champions said to Dr. Samuel Miller "if you are right we are infidels, and if we are right you are idolators." And Dr. Channing one of their most distinguished preachers in Boston said—"The God of the orthodox we could not love if we would, and would not if we could." Their God and ours do indeed differ exceedingly; and on the doctrines which are fundamental, and involve worship we are as opposite as light and darkness, as truth and falsehood. We never can approximate, unless we give up our God and Saviour, or they give up theirs. Because we will

not, they, in their charity, call us bigots, and a variety of other hard names. But we think, and are ready to prove, as it has been proved a thousand times, that our God and Saviour is infinitely superior to theirs, and that they are really bigotted and irrational in their religious tenets. We are well aware that they boast much of charity, of liberality and toleration, and declaim much against *uncharitableness, bigotry, intolerance, an irrational religion, and sectarianism*. 'Vindex,' 'Ultror' and all who attempt to defend Transylvania, make this kind of slang their main weapon. Indeed were we to take their word for it, we would suppose that all religionists in the world but themselves were irrational, ignorant, bigoted and uncharitable, and that they had got out a patent for charity, liberality and all good dispositions. But when we attend to the whole of their writings and character, it would seem that they suppose themselves privileged to be bigoted in exposing what they call bigotry in others; to be uncharitable in denouncing and vilifying those who will not burn incense to their wisdom and their God; to be *Sectarian* and irrational in opposing *Sectarianism*—to use all manner of scurrility in representing their opponents as scurrilous—and to misrepresent and falsify the characters of those who support truth and righteousness. The students of orthodox parents; those who could not relish the *Sectarianism* and favorite tenets of the President of Transylvania University, and who come under his power know something by sorrowful experience, of Socinian charity and toleration. The fact is that whilst he is inveighing against *Sectarianism* and *bigotry* he is one of the most bigoted *Sectarians* that is to be found in the west, among those who have any learning and talents and bear the name of preachers. Others are liberal and magnanimous enough to own their sect and defend it openly. They give *reasons* for their belief and their unbelief, but he adheres to a sect that he is ashamed, or afraid to own, and bigotedly clings to its dogmas without advancing his reasons, or daring to submit them, unless to boys, or in the mouths of some dead author. For him to rail at others' bigotry, sectarianism and uncharitableness is at once outrageous and amusing. And we hope that he, and those writers and editors who have been bolstering him up and guarding him as a very tender, and oderiferous plant, will profit by these remarks. We wish them to review candidly and calmly their pages and ours, and see which abound most in bigotry, uncharitableness, bold assertions, intolerance, scurrility and malignant defamation. We are aware that a man may become so accustomed to his own filth, that it is no filth to him, whilst his neighbor's is very offensive. We know that men have gloried in their shame, and reproached others for that which is their true glory. How far this is applicable to the editor of the *Pamphleteer*, and how far to *Vindex, Ultror*, and the editors of *Lexington*, and Unitarians in general, I am willing to submit to the impartial and candid reader of our several pages and writings. The *Friend to Truth*, appears to have understood Socinianism both in its theory and its patrons, and with great propriety does he



speak of its baleful influence. Some may think it merely stands opposed to Presbyterianism, and that other denominations in this western country, may view it as very harmless. This however is not the fact. All genuine Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians view it in the same light with the Presbyterians. And if all of those sects do not make common cause against it, they are either laboring under the want of correct information, are imposed on, or act not according to the faith held out in their public declarations. On several subjects these various denominations differ among themselves, yet they acknowledge each other as constituting sections of the one visible church of Christ. But hitherto they have severally agreed to disown and reject Socinianism as anti-christian, and as excluding its subjects from christian fellowship. We have dwelt upon this subject because Socinians have imposed upon many by professions of christianity, of charity and liberality; and by representing the differences between them and the orthodox christians of a very trifling and unimportant nature. We presume that it is thro' this imposition that many have thought that we were unreasonable and intolerant in objecting to a Socinian President in our University. Could we recognize him as a christian, and a Gospel Minister, as we recognize those in good regular standing in the churches just mentioned, we might with some plausibility be charged with bigotry or unseasonable sectarianism, in refusing him a peaceable seat in the chair which he occupies.

---

When the preceding strictures were made the following article came to hand, in the Boston Recorder, and as it shows that President Holley, and his Socinian friends, in and about Boston, use the same language, and are the same in spirit and manner; and as the writer's sentiments exactly correspond with those expressed above, it was determined that they should appear together.

#### CATHOLICISM.

MR. WILLIS—In the present age of light and liberty, it is somewhat amusing to observe the different modes which are adopted, to gain the reputation of an enlightened catholicism. Some will adduce their own peculiar faith or creed, in proof of their exemption from the bigotry and shackles of former times. They will discuss with zeal the arguments which support it, and will give the same kind of evidence of their strict and unqualified adherence to it tho' inferior perhaps in degree, which Calvin and Socinus did, in favor of their respective systems. They rely, solely, on the intrinsic liberality of their faith, and its accommodating pliancy, for their claims to *modern* elevated character. They contend as strenuously for the distinctive doctrines of their party, cherish their peculiarities with as much fondness, and are as solicitous they should obtain a currency and prevalence in the world, as are their brethren of a different faith. In proof of this assertion, I need only refer to their voluminous writings, and unwearied efforts in the cause of their party. Now, how can men of this description defend themselves against the charge of being of, or belonging to a *sect*, a term which they seem very much to dislike, and which is defined to be "a body of

men following some particular master or united in some settled tenets." A liberal construction must, of course, be given to this definition; for no class of men would come within a literal interpretation.

There are others who profess to be inveterately opposed to all those artificial distinctions, which divide the religious world. They descant much on the bitterness and animosities of sectarianism. They indulge much in the fashionable and sickening cant of the day about superstition, bigotry, intolerance and all that sort of affair: and utterly disclaim being of any sect or party. In the same breath, they affect a universal philanthropy, and denounce those, who think *themselves right*, and *others wrong*, in their faith. Here is the point; here they have a *creed*. They *believe* it savors of a narrow-minded selfishness, of intellectual imbecility, that a man should presume to suppose his own opinion *right* in relation to a particular subject, and that of another *wrong*, which is diametrically opposed to his own. By what process of ratiocination, one can believe a proposition, and at the same time not disbelieve its opposite; I am at a loss to determine, & wish some of your readers, who have imbibed this superior light, (if any such you have) would inform me. The charge which is made against men of established opinions (for what other are sectaries) is not directed so much to the complacency they feel in their own belief, as to their presumption in considering those erroneous, whose creed is not like their own.—Strange as it may seem, there are many men amongst us of this latter description. They endeavor to conceal a perfect indifference on religious subjects under the mask of an affected and absurd liberality; for it surely is a most foolish absurdity, to suppose a man capable of believing the affirmative and negative of the same proposition at the same time. This would indeed require a tortuous and versatile faith. The Bible is a revelation from God, of the most interesting character. It is a message from him who wields the sceptre of nations, and of worlds, and who will be our final Judge. It discloses our desert and our destiny. Impressed with these truths, should we not, ought we not to cling to its hopes, to its promises, and to its doctrines, as to our only and last refuge? Is this a time for temporizing or compromising matters? Is this a time to cultivate a sensibility which revolts at the idea of discriminating in affairs of such momentous and awful concern?

---

\* Reference is made to those great and distinguishing doctrines, which form the essence of the Scriptures.

---

## BRIEF ESSAYS ON EDUCATION, NO. II.

Having briefly considered the nature and powers possessed by the ordinary subjects of education, let us next enquire into the state or condition of their nature, and the *relation* in which they stand to God.

First, The state of their nature.—Are its animal intellectual, and moral powers in due order, subordination and concord? Is the *will* cheerfully regulated, and subordinate to a correct judgement, a salutary law, and a faithful conscience? Are all the movements of their complex nature in harmony, and influenced by love to God and man? Is the knowledge of God eagerly sought after; and is he loved, obeyed, de-



lighted in and worshipped with due reverence and gratitude, when known? In short, is the nature of children, from its first movements conformed to the nature and law of God? The man who can seriously answer all these questions in the affirmative, gives strong evidence that the powers of his mind are lamentably deranged, and that he is an unfit subject for reason or argument. We know from observation, experience and the word of God, that education, if enlightened and rational, must take up its subjects as disordered, viciated and inclined to evil—alienated from God, averse to his law and under the deranging power of sin, which throws their understandings, wills, passions and consciences, into war and confusion. Were the nature of children uncorrupted, free of derangement, moving in order, subordination, harmony and love; delighting in the knowledge, the law, and worship of God, they would need no *discipline*—no reiterated instructions and admonitions, but they would of themselves, with cheerful, and rapid step, climb the heights of science, and with seraphic fire burn and adore before the throne of their God and kind benefactor.

Secondly—What is the *relation* in which the subjects of education stand to God? He stands to them in the relation of Creator, Law-Giver and Judge. The law which he has given them is holy, just and good, intended to regulate, and does reach to the heart, and the exercise of all the powers of their complex nature. That he is a righteous judge—that he will carry out and support his law, few will deny. This he must do if they be *his* creatures, the subjects of his law and government. But there is another enquiry. Do the ordinary subjects of education stand in a *friendly* relation to God, their Creator, Law-Giver and Judge? Do they mutually live and walk in friendship with each other? Does he give no intimations that he considers them as his enemies; and do not they give evidence by the dispositions which they cherish towards him, by their spontaneous fearful anticipations—by the alarms of conscience, by the general tenor of their conduct, that they are hostile to him & his government? Yes, often he sends forth upon the subjects of education all the messengers of displeasure, cuts them down when blossoming in youth, and sends them to the cold prison, where darkness and corruption reign, and rivet fast the heavy bolts of death.

They on the other hand as unequivocally declare that they are under the influence of enmity to him and stand in an hostile attitude. This relation is therefore the relation of apostate, rebellious and justly condemned creatures. The declarations of God in his written word, as well as matter of fact evince this to be the unhappy relation in which the subjects of education stand to him. He has indeed told us that he is on treating terms—he waits to be gracious, and is in Christ beseeching all, young and old, to be reconciled to him. But we know from daily observation, that the young, the subjects of education, are regardless of his intreating voice, of the overtures of mercy and reconciliation through Christ Jesus, until by an act of sovereign goodness, and almighty power their enmity is slain and their hearts changed. But without pursuing the scripture proof, and matter of fact evidence on this sub-

ject of depravity in children and of their standing in the relation of apostate, condemned creatures to God their Creator, legislator and Judge, I would observe, that the difference of opinion, which here exists among those, who as parents and teachers manage education, is a difference of no small moment—it will produce plans of discipline, of instruction, and treatment in general, as opposite as light and darkness, and which will terminate in points as distant as the poles; as joyful, or distressing as the choirs of Heaven, or the deep toned notes of woe in the regions of eternal night. The one who considers his child, or pupil diseased, and deranged by sin, under God's condemnation, will apply all the checks, all the medicines and means which are prescribed by infinite wisdom, and will endeavor to have the sentence of condemnation reversed, by directing the young culprit to the Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered the just for the unjust that he might bring us unto God—who died for our sins and rose again for our justification. He will himself daily call in the great Physician and implore his aid and healing virtue, in behalf of those committed to his care. He will impress upon them the danger they are in from their disordered and unruly passions; from the snares, the allurements, the customs, and society of the world around them. But he who considers his child, or pupil pure at heart, or holy in nature, who sees no innate disease, no derangement, or confusion in the soul—nothing in the disposition or character to subject to God's awful condemnation, will pursue a course of education, or treatment regardless of all salutary restraints; all restorative means, and all zealous exertions to bring to the Saviour. He will teach, that our nature is, as God at first made it; that our passions and appetites were given to us as we feel them, and are therefore to be indulged with impunity; that they and our reason are safe guides; that there is no danger, and great improvement or pleasure in the amusements and common customs in the polite, the theatrical and civilized world. He will teach that sin is a very venial thing, and that God the supreme Law-Giver and Judge will not be so righteous as to execute the threatening attached to his law. He will find no use for a Saviour in his School, to save either from sin here, or wrath hereafter. Now if he should at last be found deceived and a deceiver in all this; if the parent or teacher of opposite views and who pursued a different course be found correct, the results must be of unutterable moment. They, and all those over whom they had influence, must finally arrive at two goals as far assunder as the realms of light, and the place of outer darkness.

The various relations in which the subjects of education stand, or may stand, to society cannot be even mentioned at present. They are obvious to all and but little difference of opinion respecting them exists among men. Education necessarily includes them and they should be correctly understood by all parents and teachers.

The duties growing out of the relations in which the subjects of education stand to God and society are numerous; too numerous to be particularly named and illustrated in these short essays. Some of them may be mentioned when we come to consider the *objects* of education.



That an accurate knowledge of them should be possessed by all who manage educations needs no proof.

The duration of children--of young Ladies and Gentlemen is to be taken into the account of their education. That their souls are immortal; that they are not mere creatures of *time* but travellers to eternity--that they will be happy or miserable there according to the characters formed in this world, are solemn truths which few question in this enlightened age and country. Those, who assert that there is no future state of rewards and punishments--that man's duration is no more than the duration of the beasts which roam the forest, ought to herd with them and forsake the society of *rational* beings. Now if man be immortal; if the present world be only a stage where he performs his part for a short time, and then passes off to give an account, and to receive the sentence which awards to him eternal happiness or misery, the education which takes him up as a mere creature of time, and prepares him for some of the occupations and purposes of social, or civil life, without a wise reference to the life eternal, must be a contracted, imperfect and highly reprehensible.

The last question with respect to the subjects of education is, what is the object of their being? Were they made for themselves. or for their Creator? Different answers are given to these questions, and accordingly different modes of education are pursued. Those who maintain that God the Creator can find a more worthy object of action out of himself than in himself say that he made men for themselves, for their own happiness, and not for the manifestation of his glory. Accordingly they educate not for God, but teach their children and pupils to proclaim independence, to reject his government, and pursue their *own* worldly interests, and gratifications, regardless of his honor, and all the claims which he has upon them. From these cursory observations we learn that a correct and suitable education must be predicated upon a deep, extensive and accurate knowledge of the *subjects*; of their nature; their powers; their relations to God and society; their duties; their duration, and the object of their being. We also learn that a difference of opinion on any, or all of these points must lead to opposite plans and results, all which will have a bearing on the eternal interests of immortal beings.

*In our next number something will be submitted respecting the objects of Education.*

### *Some strictures on the address of the Senior Class in Transylvania University.*

The Senior Class in an address to the public, declare that the statement of the 'Citizen' respecting Dr. Holley, is *false and entirely without foundation*. And so satisfactory is their declaration, in the opinion of the Editor of the 'Lexington Public Advertiser,' that he supposes the Editor of the *Literary Pamphleteer*, "will redeem his character for veracity, by fixing the charge of falsehood on the gentleman who wrote the 'Citizen,' or that he will "produce testimony to support the alle-

gations which the address of the students is intended to disprove." It appears that the editor of the *Pamphleteer* has got into a deplorable dilemma. If the testimony of those students is good for any thing, the testimony of as large a class in opposition to it would produce nothing but doubts and uncertainty in the public mind. Some would believe the 'Citizen' and the one class, and some would believe the other. Shall the Editor of the *Pamphleteer* then acknowledge the statement of the 'Citizen' false, and give his name to the public, and thus "redeem his own character for veracity?" This would no doubt be very agreeable to the 'Senior Class,' to Mr. John Bradford, and many others of the citizens of Lexington. We however prefer slipping out of the dilemma, and leaving the witnesses and their shrewd commentator in a worse situation. Testimony to support the statement of the 'Citizen,' was pledged by the Editor of the *Pamphleteer*, when duly called for. The call has not yet been made in a stile and manner sufficiently decorous to command obedience; yet we may, when convenient, and when the testimony is put in due form submit it to an impartial public. In the mean time we except against the 'Senior Class,' being competent and credible witnesses in the case, and we shall give our reasons. We say in the case, because we would not call in question their competency and credibility in general, as witnesses; and we wish to deal as gently with the young men as will comport with the interests of truth and our own reputation. The reasons why we object to them as competent and credible witnesses in the present case are the following.

1. They were neither eye nor ear witnesses of the facts alledged against President Holley. When he tortured the feelings of the sober and religious students, as stated by the 'Citizen,' the present Senior Class, if in the University, were attending the other Professors, or preparing in their rooms for recitation. If the public do not know, they ought to know, that none but the Senior Class attend the Lectures of the President on Metaphysics and Moral Phylosophy. It was in these Lectures that he played off his profane anecdotes and ridiculed the fundamental doctrines of christianity. The present Senior Class being recently formed, and admitted to the Lecture room of the President, are as unable to testify what he said, or did not say, a year, or two before in that room, as they are to testify what he did not preach in Boston, previous to his coming to the west. And were these young gentlemen to appear before a court of justice, and a set of cross-questioning Lawyers with their testimony and even Mr. Bradford at their elbow, they would certainly rue the day they ever ventured on such an undertaking. Let us examine them a little as we may suppose they would be examined. "Were you present in the year 1821, or 22, when the facts mentioned by the 'Citizen,' should have happened in the President's lecture room? *Ans.* No. How then do you know that they are not justly and truly charged on him? *Ans.* We never heard him utter such things in 1823, and we have such a good opinion of him that we believe he never did. We do not want your *opinion* or your *belief*, we wish to hear what you know as matters of fact in 1822 with respect to President



Holley's lectures and doctrines delivered then to the senior class. *Ans.* We know nothing about these facts. How then can you say, and testify that a statement made by some of the sober and religious members of the Senior class of that year respecting the President's lectures and doctrines, is *false and entirely without foundation*? Why—why—we—were requested by—to—to say so. *Judge.*—*Sheriff* take these witnesses out of court. And now Mr. Bradford will you please to go along with them; and permit the Editor of the *Pamphleteer* a little further to redeem his character for veracity, by stating that your Senior class are incompetent witnesses, even had they been present in 1821, or 22, when the President uttered the things complained of, because they are ignorant of the subjects to which he did injustice, by “degrading, jesting, &c.” to wit, the true character of Jesus Christ, the holy scriptures, and the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion. Not one of them has any just claims to a knowledge of these matters—not one of them has ever, even professed to know, love and obey the Saviour; and how then can they tell when he ‘is degraded to the level of a Socrates, a Plato, or a Zoroaster’? And how can they say, that the President never jested on the scriptures, & ridiculed the doctrines of our holy religion, when they are ignorant of the Scriptures and these doctrines. A few questions here would again fill them with confusion before any respectable court. Let it be remembered, that the President knows how “to strike and yet conceal the dagger.” The Scriptures, the peculiar christian doctrines, and the denominations, who hold them were, and still are, made the subjects of his wit and ridicule, without being explicitly designated. The young gentlemen acquainted with these subjects, and connected with one or more of the denominations at which the covered thrusts were made, could see, feel and testify with propriety that the thrusts were made. To the other students the wit and ridicule—the jesting and profane anecdotes of their beloved President might be very amusing, whilst they were not aware of the point and particular bearing. Now supposing a number of them from the former senior classes should come forward and testify that the allegations against the President are false, we would and could justly except against them as competent witnesses in the case. Their ignorance of the matters involved would preclude their testimony, or render it entirely nugatory.

2. We object to the ‘Senior class,’ as witnesses in the case. because they were implicated along with the President in the statement of the ‘Citizen,’ and likewise in the first number of the *Pamphleteer*. It appears they followed his example in running the round of his favorite amusements of the card-table, the ball-room, the Theatre and race-field, ignorant and regardless of the Saviour, the Holy Scriptures and the doctrines of christianity. And so extremely enraged were they at the Editor of the *Pamphleteer* for the allegations published, that they threatened him with some of their skill and power in mobocracy if he should appear in Lexington. But why not threaten the Trustees of the University and the members of the Legislature for slandering

them and their immaculate President? It is well known that the Trustees forwarded a memorial and petition to the Legislature, praying that a law might be passed to suppress Billiard-tables, gambling, &c. within a certain distance of the University; and the main argument urged in favor of the petition was, that the students indulged excessively in the practice complained of. The petition was opposed, and finally rejected in the Legislature upon the ground that the reformation should commence with the President and other officers of the University, and that unless it commenced there legislation would have no effect. Now is it not a little marvelous that those identical students, so enraged at the 'Citizen,' and the Editor of the *Pamphleteer*, for hinting at their characters—those notorious, excessive gamblers, mentioned without reserve on the floor of the Legislature, should in a few weeks come forward as sober, religious students, and talk of "the best feelings of their nature," and give testimony to clear their ring-leader of charges of irreligion made upon the information of students of a very opposite character? It is truly a pity that young gentlemen, who might have been an honor to any institution, should be delivered into the hands of a President to drill them first in a course injurious to their own moral character and best interests, & then to bring them forward to testify for his and their own exculpation! Will high minded Kentuckians put up with this? And must such testimony silence the voice of truth and reform?

3. We object to the testimony of the 'Senior class' because the chairman of their committee, has frequently communicated to persons of respectability, things concerning Dr. Holley the reverse of those stated in the printed address. A correspondent in Lexington thus writes, "The chairman of that committee has communicated more of Mr. Holley's objectionable doctrines to me and my family than any other person I believe ever did. He has stated many things against him, and has appeared to feel as much concern about his course as any young man, who was destitute of religion could do. His course is a very extraordinary one. Neither the chairman, nor one of the committee have any pretensions to religion, or the knowledge of the scriptures on their doctrines. But they may probably answer Mr. H's purpose. You may make any use you please of this statement & if it should become necessary, I can prove the whole true by several respectable witnesses." We hope these exceptions to the Senior class as competent and credible witnesses will be considered good and valid by all impartial judges, and that a final decision will be withheld until the testimony on the other side be produced.

It is also hoped that Mr. John Bradford and other Editors, in Lexington, who have published the address of the Senior class 'will redeem' or sustain their character for impartiality, and honorable dealing, by republishing these strictures, without their own partial, and unfair comments.